

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR 14 - 0606 EMC
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIATE ACT
Stanley Michael ; Gutierrez-Arana ; Defendant.	JAN 29 2015
Defendant.	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on $\frac{\sqrt{AN. 29}}{\sqrt{2015}}$, 2015, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{\sqrt{AN. 29}}{\sqrt{2015}}$, 2015 to $\frac{\sqrt{2000}}{\sqrt{2000}}$, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would b See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	e likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proof or law, that it is unreasonable to expec	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of osecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	eny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, ediligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
	inreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time ting into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 1/29 (2015)	JOSEPH C. SPERO United States Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney